Docket No. AINNO.0110 Patent

## **REMARKS**

Claims 61-79 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3-21, 23-41, and 43-60 have been cancelled. Claims 61-79 have been added.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Schaefer reference (US 2003/0084429) cited by the Examiner appears to have some superficial similarities with the present invention is as much as it is directed toward product testing software. However, a closer reading of Schaefer reveals that it does not in fact teach all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

First and foremost, the present invention is directed toward product testing within a manufacturing environment. In contrast, Schaefer is directed toward software development. The process of writing software does not fall under the category of manufacturing according to any common or reasonable use of that term.

Furthermore, the process taught in Schaefer does involve an electronic product design document from which test specifications are drawn. Schaefer uses GUI maps, which are files that contain information about user interface objects. These GUI maps are then translated into database tables. The GUI maps relate to the organization of the software and are used to locate software objects. The GUI maps do not contain any normative data regarding product testing specifications and are not equivalent to the design document of the claimed invention.

A separate data input component is used by Schaefer to create test cases to be entered into the tables created from the GUI maps. The tables allow the test cases to be matched with the correct execution paths. Schaefer does teach importing data from a structured document like a spread sheet (paragraph [0053]). However, this imported data is merely example input data used to run specific execution paths and does not constitute normative testing specifications taken from a product design document.

Docket No. AINNO.0110 Patent

## **Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: February 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Carstens

Reg. No. 34,134

Carstens & Cahoon, LLP

PO Box 802334

Dallas, TX 75380

(972) 367-2001

Attorney for Applicants